



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/557,072	04/18/2006	Sebastien Rose	CEPT-0015	3864
46347 7590 06/30/2008 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STRET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER O SULLIVAN, PETER G	
			ART UNIT 1621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/557,072

**Applicant(s)**

ROSE, SEBASTEIN

**Examiner**

Peter G. O'Sullivan

**Art Unit**

1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF 298)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application which should be reviewed for errors.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 and 5-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In applicants specification, pages 5 and 8, the concentration of DMSAM in solvent is a factor in determining granulometry. In claim 7, the term, particularly, is used leaving doubt as to the scope of the claim.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 18-21, 24, 25 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lafon, US 4,927,855, and Grebow et al., US 5,618,845 (31 only). Lafon discloses the reaction of DMSAM with ammonia in methanol wherein the reaction parameters are the same as claimed in applicants' claims, therefore the granulometry of the Modafinil produced is the same. Grebow et al. disclose Modafinil with a granulometry the same as applicants although produced by a different method. No difference is seen in the product.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teaching of Lafon, US 4927,855, and Grebow et al. 5,618,845, in view of Singer et al., WO 02/10125, and Laurent, US 5,719,168. Lafon discloses the reaction of DMSAM with ammonia in methanol wherein the reaction parameters are the same as claimed in applicants' claims, therefore the granulometry of the Modafinil produced is the same. Grebow et al. disclose Modafinil with a granulometry the same as applicants although produced by a different method. The instant invention differs from the teaching of Lafon and Grebow et al. in that other reaction conditions and a solvent comprising water may be used. Singer et al. disclose Modafinil form I is produced by crystallization from methanol (s. p. 9, ll. 17-19). Laurent et al. is relied on to disclose the use of a solvent comprising water in example 3c. It would have been prima facie obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to start with the teaching of the cited references, to make applicants' processes and to expect to obtain Modafinil of a defined granularity. Although the reaction conditions may change, the result is a product of defined granularity and applicants have not shown an unexpected beneficially useful result for these reaction conditions.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Peter G. O'Sullivan at telephone number (571)272-0642.

Art Unit: 1621

/Peter G O'Sullivan/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621